



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,745	08/28/2003	Jyunichi Nakamura	060914-0117-US	5720

9629 7590 09/09/2005

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

WILLIAMS, ALEXANDER O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2826

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/649,745

Applicant(s)

NAKAMURA ET AL.

Examiner

Alexander O. Williams

Art Unit

2826

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 12 and 14-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 16 to 21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 14, 15 and 22-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2826

Serial Number: 10/649745 Attorney's Docket #: 060914-117-US

Filing Date: 8/28/2003; claimed foreign priority to 10/31/2001

Applicant: Nakamura et al.

Examiner: Alexander Williams

This application is a divisional application of serial # 10/281163, filed 10/28/02.
This application is now U.S. Patent # 6,759,739.

Applicant's Amendment filed 8/29/05 has been acknowledged.

Applicant's election without traverse of the species of figures 1, 2 and 8 (claims 1, 12, 13, 14 and 15), filed 9/22/04, has been acknowledged. However, claim 15 depends from a nonelected claim 5 and will not be examined. Claims 1, 12-14 and newly added 22-26 was examined.

This application contained claims 5, 6, 7, 8, 15 and 16 to 21 drawn to an invention non-elected without traverse.

Claims 2-11, 13 and 16-21 have been canceled.

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claims 1, 12, 14, 15 and 22 to 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Note: In claim 1, 12 and 22, the claim language of "to be mounted" does not claim the semiconductor element as a claimed final structure. Does the semiconductor element belong as a final structure of the device?

In claim 14, it is confusing to what is meant by "in the form of bump". Should this be in the form a or the bump...pending if it is referring to the bump mention in claim 1?

Art Unit: 2826

In claim 15, it is confusing to what is meant by "in the form of **frame**". Should this be in the form a frame"? Now in claim 15, "in the form of a bump" does this refer to a different bump than the claimed bump in claim 1 or is this a new bump? Check antecedent basis for a bump or the bump.

Any of claims 1, 12, 14, 15 and 22 to 26 not specifically addressed above are rejected as being dependent on one or more of the claims which have been specifically objected to above.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Initially, it is noted that the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection based on pads and bumps deals with an issue (i.e., the integration of multiple pieces into one piece or conversely, using multiple pieces in replacing a single piece) that has been previously decided by the courts.

In Howard v. Detroit Stove Works 150 U.S. 164 (1893), the Court held, "it involves no invention to cast in one piece an

article which has formerly been cast in two pieces and put together...."

In In re Larson 144 USPQ 347 (CCPA 1965), the term "integral" did not define over a multi-piece structure secured as a single unit. More importantly, the court went further and stated, "we are inclined to agree with the solicitor that the use of a one-piece construction instead of the [multi-piece] structure disclosed in Tuttle et al. would be merely a matter of obvious engineering choice" (bracketed material added). The court cited In re Fridolph for support.

In re Fridolph 135 USPQ 319 (CCPA 1962) deals with submitted affidavits relating to this issue. The underlying issue in In re Fridolph was related to the end result of making a multi-piece structure into a one-piece structure. Generally, favorable patentable weight was accorded if the one-piece structure yielded results not expected from the modification of the two-piece structure into a single piece structure.

Claims 1, 14, 15 and 22-26, **insofar as they can be understood**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamoi (Japan Patent Application # 11-74649).

1. For example, Kamoi (figures 1 to 2d) specifically figure 1 show a multilayered substrate 1 for a semiconductor device, comprising: a multilayered substrate body 1 formed of a plurality of conductor layers 2 and insulation layers 1a, 1b, and having a face for mounting a semiconductor element 5 thereon and another face for external connection terminals 3b, the face for mounting a semiconductor element with comprising pads 3a, 7 through which the substrate is connected to the semiconductor element to be mounted thereon, and the face for external connection terminals comprising pads 3b through which the substrate is connected to an external electrical circuit, wherein a reinforcing sheet 6a, 6b is joined to each of the face for mounting a

Art Unit: 2826

semiconductor element thereon and the face for external connection terminals of the multilayered substrate body, and wherein the pads provided at the face for mounting a semiconductor element 5 thereon are in the form of a bump 3a,7 so that the tip of the pad protrudes from the face for mounting a semiconductor element of the multilayered substrate body.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the combination of the bumps with pads and the pad protrudes from the face as "merely a matter of obvious engineering choice" as set forth in the above case law.

Response

Applicant's arguments filed 3/8/05 have been fully considered, but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejections detailed above.

The insertion of Applicant's additional claimed language in the amendment filed 3/8/0500, for example, "in claims 1, 15 and new claims 22-26" cause for further search and consideration to make this action final.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See M.P.E.P. § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY

PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE
OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

The listed references are cited as of interest to this application, but not applied at this time.


Field of Search	Date
U.S. Class and subclass: 257/700,701,758,790,698,704,707,710,680,774,712,7137 20,787,788,737,738,717	12/3/04 5/25/05 9/6/05
Other Documentation: foreign patents and literature in 257/700,701,758,790,698,704,707,710,680,774,712,7137 20,787,788,737,738,717	12/3/04 5/25/05 9/6/05
Electronic data base(s): U.S. Patents EAST	12/3/04 5/25/05

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander O Williams whose telephone number is (571) 272 1924. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30 AM -7:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272 1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2826

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Alexander O Williams
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2826

AOW
9/6/05